



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,397	09/16/2004		Denis Burke Drennan	A4-1800	5396
27127	7590	03/04/2005	EXAMINER		INER
HARTMAN & HARTMAN, P.C. 552 EAST 700 NORTH				PATTERSON, MARIE D	
VALPARAISO, IN 46383			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,			3728	
				DATE MAIL ED: 03/04/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		SP					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/711,397	DRENNAN, DENIS BURKE					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Marie Patterson	3728					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron cause the application to become ABANDONI	mely filed ys will be considered timely. n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>_</u> .						
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>16 September 2004</u> is/a	10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>16 Se<i>ptember</i> 2004</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		• •					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		•					
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	e Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents 		a)-(d) or (f).					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received in Applicat	tion No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	· ·	red in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau	` ' ' '						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receiv	ed.					
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summar						
2)	Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal	∂ate Patent Application (PTO-152)					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/16/04</u> .	6) Other:						

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 20 is vague and indefinite because it is not clear what structural limitations applicant intends to encompass with such language.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-3, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gaylord (5452527) in view of Richbourg (4899468).

Gaylord shows a cast shoe comprising an air-insufflated outer sole (30), an inner sole (31 and 70), a strap (53), an upper (42), and a tread pattern (32) substantially as claimed except for the exact thickness of the outer sole. Richbourg teaches forming a cast shoe with a uniformly thick heel portion (a and b) and a tapered toe portion (c). It would have been obvious to form the outer sole as taught by Richbourg in the shoe of Gaylord to facilitate walking and to make walking more comfortable.

In reference to claim 2, official notice is taken that it is well known and conventional to provide elastic portions or to make straps from elastic materials to allow the straps to more securely fasten around a wearer's foot. It would have been obvious to provide

Application/Control Number: 10/711,397

Art Unit: 3728

elastic portions in the straps in the shoe of Gaylord as modified above to allow the straps to fasten the foot more securely.

4. Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claims 1-3 and 11 above, and further in view of Sessa (5918385).

Gaylord as modified above shows a cast shoe substantially as claimed except for the exact tread pattern. Sessa teaches a tread pattern which has tapered "D-shaped" raised elements (24). It would have been obvious to use the tread pattern as taught by Sessa in the shoe of Gaylord as modified above to increase traction and cushioning.

5. Claims 7-9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claims 1-3 and 11 above, and further in view of Lu (6282818).

Gaylord as modified above shows a cast shoe substantially as claimed except for air pockets. Lu teaches providing air pockets (10) in an outer sole. It would have been obvious to provide air pockets as taught by Lu in the shoe of Gaylord as modified above to decrease weight, increase comfort, and cushioning.

6. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claims 7-9 above, and further in view of Stubblefield (4449307).

Gaylord as modified above shows a cast shoe substantially as claimed except for the exact arrangment of the air pockets. Stubblefield teaches forming the air pockets in the toe portion with a greater volume than the heel portion. It would have been obvious to form the pockets with volume variation as taught by Stubblefield in the shoe of Gaylord

Art Unit: 3728

as modified above to adjust the cushioning and support needed by various portions of the sole.

7. Claims 12-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claims 4-6 above, and further in view of Lu (6282818).

Gaylord as modified above shows a cast shoe substantially as claimed except for air pockets. Lu teaches providing air pockets (10) in an outer sole. It would have been obvious to provide air pockets as taught by Lu in the shoe of Gaylord as modified above to decrease weight, increase comfort, and cushioning.

8. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claims 12-18 and 20 above, and further in view of Stubblefield (4449307).

Gaylord as modified above shows a cast shoe substantially as claimed except for the exact arrangment of the air pockets. Stubblefield teaches forming the air pockets in the toe portion with a greater volume than the heel portion. It would have been obvious to form the pockets with volume variation as taught by Stubblefield in the shoe of Gaylord as modified above to adjust the cushioning and support needed by various portions of the sole.

1. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Other useful information can be obtained at the PTO Home Page at www.uspto.gov.

In order to avoid potential delays, Technology Center 3700 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office Actions directly into the Center at (703) 872-9306

Application/Control Number: 10/711,397 Page 5

Art Unit: 3728

(FORMAL FAXES ONLY). Please identify Examiner <u>Marie Patterson</u> of Art Unit <u>3728</u> at the top of your cover sheet.

Any inquiry concerning the MERITS of this examination from the examiner should be directed to Marie Patterson whose telephone number is (571) 272-4559. The examiner can normally be reached from 6AM - 4PM Mon-Wed.

Marie Patterson Primary Examiner Art Unit 3728